

Application Serial No. 10/551,817  
Reply to office action of January 7, 2009

PATENT  
Docket: CU-4448

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-4 are pending in the present application before this response. By the present response no claims are amended and new claims are added. No new matter has been added.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

**In the office action (page 2), the examiner rejects claims 1 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,374,112 (Widegren).**

The applicants respectfully disagree with these rejections and submit that the claims, as they now stand, are in condition for allowance.

The examiner's attention is respectfully directed to the following technical features in independent claim 1 of the present application that require

--creating mapping between said one of the plurality of data transmission management boards and a second ATM interface board, by the radio signaling management board, said one of the plurality of data transmission management boards having mapping to the first ATM interface board before handover--.

First, the above noted limitations in the present application require that the mapping exists **within** a Radio Network Controller (RNC) having a distributed architecture, and **between** the data transmission management boards and one of different ATM interface boards in the Radio Network Controller. Second, the above noted limitations in the present application require that one of a plurality of data transmission management boards has mapping to **both** of the first ATM interface board and the second ATM interface board. Third, the above noted limitations in the present application require that said one of a plurality of data transmission management boards is the same during the user equipment handover procedure.

The examiner asserts in the Office Action (page 2-3) that Widegren teaches

"creating mapping between said one of the plurality of data transmission management boards and a second ATM interface board, by the radio

Application Serial No. 10/551,817  
Reply to office action of January 7, 2009

PATENT  
Docket: CU-4448

signaling management board, said one of the plurality of data transmission management boards having mapping to the first ATM interface board before handover" (See Widegren col. 3, lines 32-54).

After carefully studying Widegren's particular disclosure, the applicants respectfully disagree with the examiner's above assertion. The applicants believe that Widegren does not teach or even hints at the mapping **within** a RNC nor teaches the mapping between one of the plurality of data transmission management boards and a first or second ATM interface board. The applicants further believe that Widegren does not teach or even hints at one of a plurality of data transmission management boards is the same during the user equipment handover procedure.

The applicants understand that the examiner cited Widegren for disclosing RNCs in UTRAN for allocating radio channel resources during establishing a connection between a core network service node and a mobile station. Other than Widegren disclosing mapping, Widegren discloses the following: (1) when establishing each bearer, the UTRAN flexibly "maps" or allocates the radio access bearer to physical transport and radio channel resources through the UTRAN and over the radio air interface, respectively (See Widegren col. 3, lines 35-40); (2) a radio access bearer is a logical connection with the mobile station through the UTRAN and over the radio air interface and corresponds to a single data stream (See Widegren, col. 2, lines 61-64); and (3) if dedicated channel already exists between the UTRAN and mobile radio, a new logical connection is mapped to the already-existing dedicated channel since the UTRAN can multiplex different logical connections associated with the mobile station onto the single dedicated channel (See Widegren, Col. 4, lines 17-22).

The applicants believe that Widegren discloses that the mapping exists **outside** the RNC and between radio access bearer and transport and radio channel resources. Since Widegren's invention does not relate to the internal architecture of a RNC, radio access bearer and transport and radio channel resources can not be deemed to be equal to the data transmission management boards and ATM interface boards inside the Radio Network Controller. In contrast to what Widegren discloses, the present invention requires that the mapping exists **within** a Radio Network Controller (RNC) having a distributed architecture, and **between** the data transmission management

Application Serial No. 10/551,817  
Reply to office action of January 7, 2009

PATENT  
Docket: CU-4448

boards and one of different ATM interface boards **inside** the Radio Network Controller. Therefore, the "mapping" disclosure in Widegren is in no what equivalent to that required in the present invention.

Furthermore, by referring to fig. 1 and fig. 4 of Widegren, it can be understood that the object of mapping radio access bearer to radio channel resources is responding to the request transmitted to the UTRAN for establishing a connection between a core network service node and a mobile station. That Widegren object is obviously different from and is irrelevant to what is solved by the present invention.

The present invention is realized in a radio network controller (RNC) having distributed architecture. As recited in the background of the invention, since the amount of data flow is comparatively large, the function of managing data transmission is generally realized in a **plurality of processing boards**, with one processing board providing services for a certain number of handsets (UE). Therefore, the technical problem solved by the above claimed limitations relating to "mapping" is to avoid increasing of signaling load between boards and degrading of call handling capability of the RNC system caused by frequent UE handover.

As a result, neither the technical problem nor the technical solution of the present invention is disclosed or even hinted at by Widegren. Therefore, Widegren cannot support an anticipation rejection because Widegren does not teach or even hints at "each and every" claimed limitation of the present invention. Accordingly, the examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this anticipation rejection.

In the office action (page 4), the claims 2-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Widegren in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,801,508 (Lim).

The applicants respectfully disagree and submit that the claims, as they now stand, are in condition for allowance.

The above comments are equally applicable here in that Widegren does not teach or even hint at all of the required limitations of the present invention.

Lim is also unlike the presently claimed invention. At most Lin discloses an asynchronous transfer mode packet network for transferring packet data. Even if Lee could be viewed as teaching causing a second ATM interface board to learn an IP

Application Serial No. 10/551,817  
Reply to office action of January 7, 2009

PATENT  
Docket: CU-4448

address of the data transmission management board to learn an IP address of the second AATM interface board, by the radio signaling management board, then combining Lee with Widegren would not cure the above noted deficiencies of Widegren in replicating the presently claimed invention.

Therefore, Widegren and Lee cannot support an obviousness rejection because Widegren and Lee, in whole or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the limitations required in the presently claimed invention. Accordingly, the examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this obviousness rejection.

For the reasons set forth above, the applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-4, now pending in this application, are in condition for allowance over the cited references. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and earnestly solicit an indication of allowable subject matter.

This amendment is considered to be responsive to all points raised in the office action. Should the examiner have any remaining questions or concerns, the examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to expeditiously resolve such concerns.

Respectfully submitted,



Loren K. Thompson, Ph.D., Reg. No. 45,918  
Ladas & Parry LLP  
224 South Michigan Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60604  
(312) 427-1300

Dated: April 7, 2009